

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

DANTE L. THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIFTH THIRD BANK,

Defendant.

CIVIL COMPLAINT

CASE NO. 1:17-cv-06963

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT

NOW comes DANTE L. THOMPSON (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd. (“Sulaiman”), complaining as to the conduct of FIFTH THIRD BANK, (“Defendant”), as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action for damages pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) under 47 U.S.C. §227 and the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act (“ICFA”) under 815 ILCS 505/1 for Defendant's unlawful practices.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This action arises under and is brought pursuant to the TCPA. Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 47 U.S.C §227, 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1337, as the action arises under the laws of the United States and supplemental jurisdiction exists for the state law claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1337.

3. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 as Defendant conducts business in the Northern District of Illinois and a substantial portion of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within the Northern District of Illinois.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is a 37 year old natural person residing at 1780 224th Street, Sauk Village, Illinois, which falls within the Northern District of Illinois.

5. Plaintiff is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).

6. Defendant is a national banking institution organized under the laws of the United States with its headquarters located in Cincinnati, Ohio. Defendant is a foreign company that conducts business with consumers across the country, including Illinois. Defendant’s registered address for purpose of process is 50 West Broad Street, Suite 1330, Columbus, Ohio.

7. Defendant is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).

8. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives and insurers at all time relevant to the instant action.

FACTS SUPPORTING CAUSES OF ACTION

9. In approximately July 2017, Plaintiff began receiving calls from Defendant to his cellular phone, (708) XXX-4814.

10. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was the sole subscriber, owner, and operator of the cellular phone ending in 4814. Plaintiff is and has always been financially responsible for the cellular phone and its services.

11. Defendant mainly uses the phone number (800) 837-5745 when placing calls to Plaintiff's phone, but upon information and belief Defendant may have used other numbers to contact Plaintiff.

12. Upon information and belief, the above-referenced phone number ending in 5745 is regularly utilized by Defendant during its contacts with consumers.

13. Plaintiff has transacted with Defendant for financial services, which has been the subject of Defendant's contacts with Plaintiff.

14. Since that time, Plaintiff has been receiving calls to his cellular phone from Defendant on a regular and persistent basis.

15. When Plaintiff answers call from Defendant, Plaintiff experiences a pause lasting several seconds in length before Defendant's representative comes on the line.

16. Aggravated and confused by the constant phone calls, Plaintiff demanded that Defendant cease contacting him.

17. Despite Plaintiff's demands, Defendant has continued to call Plaintiff's cellular phone on a regular basis up until the date of the filing of this complaint.

18. Defendant has called Plaintiff's cellular phone multiple times on the same day, even after being told to stop.

19. For instance, on or about August 20, 2017, Plaintiff received at least 3 calls from Defendant.

20. Plaintiff has received not less than 20 phone calls from Defendant since demanding that it stop calling him.

21. Frustrated over the persistent calls, Plaintiff spoke with Sulaiman regarding his rights, resulting in costs and expenses.

22. With the goal of specifically addressing Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has expended approximately \$59.00 to purchase and maintain an application subscription on his cellular phone to block the calls, resulting in pecuniary loss.

23. Plaintiff has been unfairly harassed by Defendant's actions.

24. Plaintiff has suffered concrete harm as a result of Defendant's actions, including but not limited to, invasion of privacy, aggravation that accompanies incessant telephone calls, emotional distress, increased risk of personal injury resulting from the distraction caused by the never-ending calls, increased usage of his telephone services, loss of cellular phone capacity, diminished cellular phone functionality, decreased battery life on his cellular phone, and diminished space for data storage on his cellular phone.

COUNT I – VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

25. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 24 as though fully set forth herein.

26. The TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(iii), prohibits calling persons on their cellular phone using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) without their consent. The TCPA, under 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), defines an ATDS as “equipment which has the capacity...to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and to dial such numbers.”

27. Defendant used an ATDS in connection with its communications directed towards Plaintiff. The noticeable pause which Plaintiff experiences during answered phone calls from Defendant is instructive that Defendant is using an ATDS to place calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone. Additionally, the nature and frequency of Defendant's contacts points to the involvement of an ATDS.

28. Defendant violated the TCPA by placing at least 20 phone calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone using an ATDS without his consent. Any consent Plaintiff *may* have given to Defendant was explicitly revoked by his multiple demands that it cease contacting him.

29. The calls placed by Defendant to Plaintiff were regarding business transactions and not for emergency purposes as defined by the TCPA under 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(i).

30. Under the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for at least \$500.00 per call. Moreover, Defendant's willful and knowing violations of the TCPA should trigger this Honorable Court's ability to triple the damages to which Plaintiff is otherwise entitled to under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DANTE L. THOMPSON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statutes and regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff damages of at least \$500.00 per phone call and treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(3)(B)&(C);
- c. Awarding Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees;
- d. Enjoining Defendant from further contacting Plaintiff; and
- e. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

**COUNT II – VIOLATIONS OF THE ILLINOIS
CONSUMER FRAUD AND DECEPTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT**

31. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 30 as though fully set forth herein.
32. Plaintiff is a "person" and "consumer" as defined by 815 ILCS 505/1(c) and (e) of the ICFA.

33. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff are "trade" and "commerce" as defined by 815 ILCS 505/1(f) of the ICFA.

34. The ICFA states:

"Unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices, including but not limited to the use or employment of any deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentation or the concealment, suppression or omission of any material fact, with intent that others rely upon the concealment, suppression or omission of such material fact . . . in the conduct of any trade or commerce are hereby declared unlawful whether any person has in fact been misled, deceived or damaged thereby." 815 ILCS 505/2.

35. Defendant violated 815 ILCS 505/2 by engaging in an unfair and deceptive act or practice in contacting Plaintiff. It was unfair for Defendant to relentlessly contact Plaintiff through means of an ATDS when he requested that it no longer do so. Defendant ignored Plaintiff's requests and continued to systematically place calls to his cellular phone without his consent. By doing so, Defendant falsely and deceptively represented that it had the legal ability to contact Plaintiff when it did not.

36. Defendant has also placed multiple calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone in the same day, even after being told to cease calling. Placing several calls in a short amount of time is extremely harassing behavior that amounts to an unfair practice.

37. The ICFA was designed to protect consumers, such as Plaintiff, from the exact behavior committed by Defendant.

38. The ICFA further states:

"Any person who suffers actual damage as a result of a violation of this Act committed by any other person may bring an action against such person. The court, in its discretion may award actual economic damages or any other relief which the court deems proper." 815 ILCS 505/10a.

39. As pled in paragraphs 20 through 24, Plaintiff has suffered actual damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful collection practices, including expending money on a monthly application subscription on his cellular phone in an attempt to block its phone calls. As such, Plaintiff is entitled to relief pursuant to 815 ILCS 505/10a. An award of punitive damages is appropriate because Defendant's conduct was outrageous, willful and wanton, and showed a reckless disregard for the rights of Plaintiff. Plaintiff repeatedly told Defendant to stop its harassing phone calls, yet he still received not less than 20 phone calls after demanding the contacts cease. Upon information and belief, Defendant regularly engages in the above described behavior against consumers in Illinois and for public policy reasons should be penalized.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DANTE L. THOMPSON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statutes and regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff actual and punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, for the underlying violations;
- c. Awarding Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees;
- d. Enjoining Defendant from further contacting Plaintiff; and
- e. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

Dated: September 27, 2017

s/ Nathan C. Volheim
Nathan C. Volheim, Esq. #6302103
Counsel for Plaintiff
Admitted in the Northern District of Illinois
Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd.
2500 South Highland Ave, Suite 200
Lombard, Illinois 60148
(630) 568-3056 (phone)
(630) 575-8188 (fax)
nvolheim@sulaimanlaw.com

Respectfully submitted,

s/Taxiarchis Hatzidimitriadis
Taxiarchis Hatzidimitriadis, Esq. #6319225
Counsel for Plaintiff
Admitted in the Northern District of Illinois
Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd.
2500 South Highland Ave, Suite 200
Lombard, Illinois 60148
(630) 581-5858 (phone)
(630) 575-8188 (fax)
thatz@sulaimanlaw.com